## NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

## IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

In re SILVANNA S., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

V.

SILVANNA S.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F042658

(Super. Ct. No. 02CEJ600778-1)

## **OPINION**

## **THE COURT**\*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Fresno County. Timothy Kams, Judge.

Alan Siraco, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Bill Lockyer, Attorney General, Robert R. Anderson, Chief Assistant Attorney General, Jo Graves, Assistant Attorney General, and Carlos A. Martinez, Deputy Attorney General, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-00O00-

<sup>\*</sup> Before Vartabedian, Acting P.J., Buckley, J., and Cornell, J.

Appellant Silvanna S., a minor, was initially adjudged a ward of the juvenile court in August 2002, after admitting an allegation that she committed a violation of Penal Code section 415 (disturbing the peace). In September 2002, following the subsequent disposition hearing, the court placed her on probation for one year; ordered her committed to the Day Reporting Center (DRC) Program for 180 days; and ordered that she be on the juvenile electronic monitoring program for the first 30 days of that period.

In January 2003, appellant admitted she violated the conditions of her probation by testing positive for marijuana use. In February 2002, following a disposition hearing, the court vacated appellant's commitment to DRC; placed her on the electronic monitoring program for 90 days; ordered her to enroll in the community school; and ordered her to complete 14 days on the Community Service Work Program. The instant appeal followed.

Appellant's appointed appellate counsel has filed an opening brief which summarizes the pertinent facts, with citations to the record, raises no issues, and asks that this court independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.)

Appellant has not responded to this court's invitation to submit additional briefing.

Following independent review of the record, we have concluded that no reasonably arguable legal or factual issues exist.

The judgment is affirmed.